

## **Final**

### **SATS Strategic Council Meeting Washington, DC August 15, 2003**

In accordance with Section 7.1 of the Small Aircraft Transportation System (SATS) Joint Sponsored Research and Development Agreement (JSRDA), the SATS Strategic Council met on August 15, 2003.

The Co-chairmen called to order at 8:40 am in the conference room of the General Aviation Manufacturers Association (GAMA) office, located at 1400 K Street, Washington, D.C.

Members and individuals in attendance included:

<u>REPRESENTATIVE</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
Doug Dwyer-Co-Chair	NASA LaRC
Bob Dunn-Co-Chair	NCAM
Doug Arbuckle	NASA LaRC
Steve Hampton	Embry-Riddle Aeronautical Univ. (ERAU)
Randy Kanegy	Aircraft Owners & Pilots Association (AOPA)
Alice Massey	NASA LaRC- Executive Secretary
John Olcott	General Aero Company, Inc.
Neil Planzer	Boeing Company
Ron Swanda	GAMA
Margie Tower Smith	American Association of Airport Executives
Lou Williams	Research Triangle Inst. (RTI)

Alternates attending on behalf of full-time representatives included:

David Cross for Henry Ogrodzinski	National Association of State Aviation Officials (NASAO)
John McKinley for Norris Krone	Maryland Advanced Development Laboratory

SATS Strategic Council members not in attendance included:

Tim Coons	ModWorks, Inc.
Jim Coyne	National Air Transportation Association (NATA)
Richard John	Volpe National Transportation System
Keith McCrea	Virginia Dept. of Aviation
John Wiley	Federal Aviation Administration (FAA)

Ex-Officio members in attendance included:

Bruce Holmes	NASA LaRC
Pete McHugh	FAA

Ex-Officio member not in attendance included:

Jack Sheehan

NCAM

Others individuals invited to participate in the SATS Strategic Council and in attendance were:

Paul Masson

STARNet

John Gallman

Cessna Aircraft

Lee Snowberger

Conwal (Consultant for TSA)

### **8:40 Co-chairs opened meeting and introductions**

The co-chairs asked individuals in attendance to introduce themselves and their respective organizations.

Paul Masson presented a review of the agenda review and meeting guidelines. Reference was made to today's presentations contained in the briefing books. Masson reviewed the objectives of the Council meetings spanning the period March to the present, and restated the Council's decision to develop a technology driven roadmap as a tool to provide strategic guidance for the project. Masson reviewed the steps in developing a roadmap, and reviewed the four steps completed to date. Masson then described the specific roadmap milestone topics to be discussed today:

- Non-Federal Leadership
- State and Local Government
- Aviation Transport Policy
- FAA
- Technology Development
- Environment

Masson stated that future Strategic Council meeting would address the following topics:

- Pilots and Training
- Finance & Insurance
- Business Model

A member asked if everyone on the Council still agreed with the vision statement that was driving the roadmap. Masson said that there were some differences in articulation of vision and that a number of members suggested creating a name other than "SATS" to describe the vision. He went on to say that the two members that expressed doubt were at SATS Labs and their doubt was based on uncertainty about how working toward the vision would benefit their short-term interests. Bob Dunn stated that the two NCAM members of the SATS labs question the value of the roadmapping process but that was because its link to their needs was not yet clear. Dunn stated that the lack of clear link is because the Council has been concentrating on the process. One member stated that he didn't realize that the roadmapping process was technology driven and suggested it should be capability driven. It was suggested that the roadmap address the issues of security. After a brief discussion, it was concluded that the roadmap would include milestones that address a variety of issues, not just technology.

### **9:25 Topic: Non-Federal Leadership**

Masson defined “non-federal leadership” as non-federal individuals and/or organizations that would lead the dialogue and development of a roadmap to achieve the agreed upon vision. A member re-iterated concern that some members of the Council did not agree with the previously developed vision. Masson stated that only two Strategic Council members expressed doubts about the national value of achieving the vision. Masson stated that both members expressed those doubts on the basis that their interest was primarily to pursue short-term research rather than long-term transportation system deployment. Masson went on to state that both the two members that had expressed reservations about the vision still agreed with the vision as a “modified consensus”, meaning that they supported achievement of the long-term objective, but preferred to focus their personal time on short-term research projects.

Bob Dunn provided a handout of his assessment of the milestones to achieve non-federal leadership to pursue the vision. The assessment was captured in a handout marked “Non-Federal Leadership Advocacy”. In the ensuing discussion, the following milestones were developed and placed on the roadmap wall chart:

#### **2004**

- Stakeholders identified
- Alliance formation Jan 2004
- Set Leadership organization (temporary) July 2004 (Agreement to concept)
- Federal Agency / Dept Advocate (at policy-making level (Jeff Shane e.g.) March 2004 Agreement to concept

Nothing was listed for the years 2005, 2010, 2015, 2020 or 2025.

No discussion was facilitated about success factors.

Bruce Holmes suggested that if the emerging private sector leadership wanted to engage foreign entities, it should deal with the government entities. A member expressed concern about assuming that NCAM would be a potential vehicle for the private sector leadership. Bob Dunn stated that private sector leadership would have to coalesce first around agreeing to achieve the vision before assumptions were made about the role of NCAM.

BREAK 10:12 –10:30

Masson asked for discussion of the non-federal leadership milestones and if they could be achieved in 2004. A member commented that they must be carefully executed and might take more time. Bob Dunn stated that NCAM has reputation (and charter as project) that is not suitable for later leadership but the Strategic Council is appropriate for the current dialogue leading to transition into a private-sector led alliance. Then that alliance could work with JPO.

#### **10:45 Topic: State and Local Government**

Masson asked for discussion of the milestones to be achieved in the topic area of State and Local Government issues. This category of issues was defined as ones under the control of state aviation

authorities and the local government owners of airports. Masson asked the members to identify any links within states that would link state aviation issues with economic development issues. Directed questions were asked of Steve Hampton and Lou Williams. After discussion, the following milestones were developed:

## **2004**

## **2005**

- SATS demonstration of technical capabilities
- Certification
- Economic Development Benefit Analysis
  - Non traditional user analysis
- Airport Needs Assessment

Success Factor: New class of airplanes

## **2010**

- Infrastructure Assessment
- Security Model (TSA acceptance)
- Airport Model
- \*Land Use – alternative use \* = late 2010 -2015
  - easements avigational
- \*Environmental
  - noise

Success Factors: Intra-state political support

## **2015**

- Funding model
- National agreements on airports strategy

## **2015 -2020**

- Policy – local on:
  - Land use
  - Zoning
  - Obstacle protection
  - Baseline Funding

## **2020**

- Enabling infrastructure

## **2025**

- *No milestones*

## **12:00 Break for LUNCH**

## **1:05 Topic: Review of State & Local Government “Roadmap” Inputs**

Discussion was renewed about the State and Local government roadmap inputs. It was suggested the timing of local policy development be shifted to an earlier date, since it takes so long to get policies adopted. The local policy issues, in turn, need to be preceded by a nationally accepted template to be accepted on airport strategy

### **1: 30 Topic: Transportation Policy**

Neil Planzer joined the Council via a conference call connection. It was noted that Dr. John could not attend the meeting, and had volunteered to identify national transportation policy milestones that fell within the purview of the Federal government. None of the members had spoken with Dr. John. It was noted that the following discussion would collect initial transportation policy milestones, with the topic to be raised again when Dr. John joined the next Strategic Council meeting.

Neil Planzer provided his viewpoint on transportation policy issues for small airplanes and airports. Discussion ensued about different national transportation policy issues. It was concluded that the newly formed Joint Program Office (JPO) was addressing a similar set of national transportation policy issues in the very near term. Discussion ensued regarding those issues that would require resolution and drive the milestones for the small aircraft/airport vision. The discussion among the Council members resulted in the following initial list of milestones specific to the agreed upon vision:

#### **2003-2004**

- National transportation demand assessment 3Q 2003
- Alignment of small aircraft/airport transportation capability within JPO broader planning
- Key enablers identified to fit into JPO Concept space

#### **2005**

- Satellite navigations approach policy
- Network enabled system datalink capability
- Access in IFR conditions

#### **2010**

- Role of controllers in system

#### **2015**

- \*Security volumes      \* between 2010 -2015
- Preserve existing airports
- Guarantee reasonable access to the system
- First in / first out vs. need

#### **2020**

- *No milestones*

#### **2025**

- *No milestones*

Questions were raised about why these milestones were stated in terms as technology based capabilities. Bruce Holmes stated that these capabilities translated into a different role for small aircraft and airports in the nation's transportation system, and therefore a different role in the nation's policy about how such aircraft and airports could meet the nation's transportation needs.

Discussion continued about what it meant to have a "national transportation policy" related to the vision about small aircraft and airports. It was concluded that the existence of a national transportation policy would facilitate addressing a wide range of issues necessary to achieve the vision.

An observer stated that the transportation policy should be based on access to airspace on a "needs" basis rather than first come/first serve access. It was countered that a needs based airspace system would result in a subjective judgment about what is "need" and represent a shift from current policy momentum. Masson noted that this was raised by an observer and asked Council members if they wanted to discuss the issue. In the ensuing discussion it was concluded that insufficient information existed to define "need" and compare it to the existing first come/first serve based policy approach.

The Council members also concluded that the policy discussion would be tabled until Neil Planzer and Richard John were available for a future meeting.

## **2:15 Topic: FAA and Transportation Policy**

Pete McHugh presented FAA perspective on the Transportation Policy. Pete made reference to a set of FAA related "milestones" he had developed for the meeting. Those milestones are attached to the minutes. Pete was asked to describe to the Council only the most significant of the milestones he had developed. Those milestones were listed as:

### **2004**

- SATS/Small airport in FAA Plans

### **2005**

- Policy: Free access to traffic and flight info including air space restrictions

### **2010**

- Capstone and Project Alpha are one
- Near all weather instrument approach cap over K20
- Alpha capability for EMS
- Cockpit centric
- Accept and certify self-separate
- Adopt philosophy multiple capability single link

### **2015**

- FAA/FCC new spectrum policy
- Single pilot/ auto flight roles

### **2020**

- UAV cargo
- Hub & spoke seamless with SCA

## 2025

- *No milestones developed*

Concern was raised that some of the milestones were described as selections of technology rather than development of capabilities. Discussion ensued and it was clarified that the description of a milestone in technology terms represented the capabilities derived from those technologies. It was agreed that technologies would not be “selected” today, and that any future technologies would have to be selected as the outcome of either that SATS demonstrations or future work.

Bob Dunn stated that discussion of the additional FAA topics was moving the Council further forward without addressing some of the key “parking lot” issues identified earlier in the day. Bob stated that, for example, the issue of what to call the vision and how to link the roadmap with current FAA projects was important. Bob went on to state that it was also important to discuss how the ideas developed from the roadmap would be communicated to the Joint Program Office. It was agreed to take a break and reset the agenda for the remainder of the afternoon.

## 3:00 Break

### 3:15 Topic: Parking Lot Issues: 1) name of end state vision and 2) alignment of roadmap planning with JPO planning

Masson stated that the remaining afternoon time would be devoted to resolving parking lot issues. Bob Dunn stated that two key parking lot issues to resolve were:

- 1) What would be the correct name for the long-term vision to be achieved by the roadmap?
- 2) What would be the appropriate method to communicate the roadmap ideas to the JPO?

The question was raised as to whether Bruce Holmes would be the appropriate member of the Council to communicate roadmap results to the JPO. NASA managers stated that Bruce’s current role and responsibilities precluded his acting as a communicator of the roadmap results to the JPO.

Discussion ensued about the timing of the JPO work. One of the Council members read off the following JPO work schedule:

- R&D Element- Chapter 5 of the plan would include the proposed research and development needs of the nation. The team preparing the draft of Chapter 5 would complete their preliminary information gathering (interviews and on-site visits) within six weeks of today.
- Information Workshop- An information gathering workshop will be held on September 15 and 16
- National Policy Workshop- A workshop addressing national policy issues will be held September 26
- Draft- A first draft referred to as a “thin framework” must be ready by the 11th of October

### Subtopic 1: Name of Envisioned Transportation Capability

A discussion ensued about the name of the vision. A consensus emerged that the name should reflect the capabilities of the system that met public needs. Capabilities would include words to reflect the need for on-demand air travel, wide access to the public, affordability, etc. A brief discussion ensued comparing these terms to the words in “SATS” which describe the components of the system, such as the airplanes and airports.

A long list of words was developed to describe the capabilities of the envisioned system. The list included, among other items, flexible, safe, aviation based, affordable, easy to use, and accessible. At the end of the discussion the following terms were combined to create a new name for the envisioned transportation capability:

### **Flexible Aviation System for Transportation from Every Runway (FASTER)**

#### Subtopic 2: Communicating FASTER Roadmap to JPO

Bob Dunn asked about the best way to communicate the FASTER roadmap input to the JPO. Doug Dwyer noted that the JPO outcomes might be used to guide decision-making on future Federal and State investment programs. For that reason, Doug noted that while it was acceptable for Federal officials to discuss elements of the FASTER vision for use within the SATS project, it would not be appropriate for Federal officials to act as the lead in communicating roadmap to the JPO. It was concluded that the communicating the roadmap idea to the JPO would have to be addressed outside the Strategic Council.

### **3: 45 Topic: Remaining Roadmap Topics and Scheduling Next Meeting**

Bob Dunn raised the issue of the further development of the roadmap. Masson briefly reviewed the results of the day’s roadmap development, and noted that milestones had not been discussed for Technology Development or the Environment. Members were asked to verbally state their availability for a next meeting. A variety of different dates were suggested during the last two weeks of September. Alice Massey stated she would contact the Members and ask them to provide dates for a next meeting to finish the roadmap development.

### **4:00 Meeting adjourned**